arXiv:1111.2980v1 [math.OA] 13 Nov 2011

ON THE STONE-WEIERSTRASS THEOREM

SILVIU TELEMAN

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to extend the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem into the framework of the general C^*-algebra theory.

To be more precise, let A be any unital C^*-algebra and $B \subset A$ any C^*-subalgebra containing the unit element $1 \in A$.

Let $F(A)$ be the set of the factorial states of A, and $P(A)$, which is a subset of $F(A)$, be the set of the pure states of A.

As generalizations of the (commutative) Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, one makes the following conjectures within the framework of the theory of C^*-algebras:

Conjecture 1.1. *If B separates $P(A)$, then $B = A$.*

Conjecture 1.2. *If B separates $F(A)$, then $B = A$.*

Of course, a positive solution of Conjecture 1.1 immediately implies a positive solution of Conjecture 1.2.

Conjecture 1.2 was proved in 1984 by Longo (see [10]) and Popa (see [12]) under the assumption that A is separable.

In this paper we shall prove Conjecture 1.2 without any separability assumption, extending in this manner the result of Longo ant Popa to arbitrary C^*-algebras.

Conjecture 1.1, in the commutative case, is equivalent to the Stone-Weierstrass theorem; it is open, in the non-commutative case, even for separable C^*-algebras.

The paper is divided into three parts: Section 2 presents general results related to the Stone-Weierstrass Problem; Section 3 presents results obtained under the additional assumption that B separates $P(A)$; Section 4 is dedicated to a very short proof of our generalization of the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem.

2. General Results Related to the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem

2.1. For any unital C^*-algebra A, we shall denote by $S(A)$ the set of its states: it is a convex subset of the Banach dual A^* of A, compact in the w^*-topology $\sigma(A^*; A)$ of A^*. By $P(A)$ we denote the set of the pure states of A. We have that $P(A) = \operatorname{ex} S(A)$. By $F(A)$ we will denote the set of all factorial (primary) states of A. We have that $P(A) \subset F(A)$.

For any $f \in S(A)$ we shall consider the associated GNS-construction, giving a cyclic representation $\pi_f \colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_f)$, with the canonical cyclic vector $\xi_f^0 \in H_f$, for which

$$f(a) = \left(\pi_f(a)\xi_f^0 \mid \xi_f^0\right) \text{ for } a \in A.$$

We recall that by the GNS-construction, one associates to f the norm-closed left ideal

$$L_f = \{a \in A; f(a^*a) = 0\},$$

and on A/L_f one introduces the scalar product

$$(\theta_f(a) \mid \theta_f(b)) = f(b^*a) \text{ for } a, b \in A, \tag{1}$$

where $\theta_f \colon A \to A/L_f$ is the canonical quotient mapping; the associated Hilbert space H_f is obtained by completing the quotient space A/L_f with respect to the associated norm, derived from the scalar product (1); the associated representation $\pi_f \colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_f)$ is obtained by extending, by continuity, the mapping

$$\pi_f(a) \colon A/L_f \to A/L_f,$$

given by

$$\pi_f(a)\theta_f(b) = \theta_f(ab) \text{ for } a, b \in A,$$

to H_f.

We shall prove now

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\pi \colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ be any representation of A and let $f \in S(\pi(A))$ be any state of $\pi(A)$. Then $\pi_f \circ \pi \colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_f)$ can be identified rith the representation $\pi_{f\circ\pi}$, corresponding by the GNS-construction to the state $f \circ \pi \in S(A)$.*

Proof. Let us denote $f \circ \pi = g$. Then we have the equalities

$$L_f = \pi(L_g) \text{ and } L_g = \pi^{-1}(L_f),$$

which are easy to prove.

We obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A \arrow[r, "\theta_g"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & A/L_g \arrow[d, "\theta"] \\
\pi(A) \arrow[r, "\theta_f"'] & \pi(A)/L_f
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\theta \colon A/L_g \to \pi(A)/L_f$ is given by the formula

$$\theta(\theta_g(A)) = \theta_f(\theta(a)) \text{ for } a \in A.$$

It is easy to see that the definition is correct. From

$$\begin{aligned}(\theta_f(\pi(a)) \mid \theta_f(\pi(b))) &= f(\pi(b)^*\pi(a)) \\ &= f(\pi(b^*a)) \\ &= g(b^*a) \\ &= (\theta_g(a) \mid \theta_g(b)) \text{ for } a, b \in A,\end{aligned}$$

it follows that θ extends to a unitary operator

$$\theta \colon H_g \to H_f,$$

for which we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(\pi_g(a)\theta_g(b)) = \theta(\theta_g(ab)) &= \theta_f(\pi(ab)) \\ &= \pi_f(\pi(a))\theta_f(\pi(b)) \\ &= \pi_f(\pi(a))\theta(\theta_g(b)) \text{ for } a, b \in A.\end{aligned}$$

This gives that $\theta \circ \pi_g(a) = \pi_f(\pi(a)) \circ \theta$ for $a \in A$. The Proposition is proved. ☐

Similar constructions and notations will be considered for any non-zero positive $f \in A^*$, with the result that, in general, $\|f\| = \|\xi_f^0\|^2$ for $f \in A_+^*$.

2.2. Following the idea of L. de Branges, which he used in proving the commutative version of the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem (see [5]), let us now consider the set

$$N = \{f \in A : f^* = f, \|f\| \le 1, f|_B\}\,.$$

It is a compact convex subset of A^*. If $B \neq A$, then $N \neq \{0\}$ and for any $f_0 \in \operatorname{ex} N$, we have $\|f_0\| = 1$.

Let $f_0 = f_1 - f_2$ be the Jordan-Hahn-Grothendieck decomposition of f_0 (see [11, Theorem 3.2.5]). Then $\|f_1\| = \|f_2\| = \frac{1}{2}$ and $2f_1 \in S(A), 2f_2 \in S(A), f_1|_B = f_2|_B$.

Since

$$\|f_1 - f_2\| = \|f_1\| + \|f_2\|,$$

it follows that the states $2f_1$ and $2f_2$ are orthogonal (see [18, Lemma 6]).

Let us define

$$f = f_1 - f_2. \tag{2}$$

By a theorem of Godement (see [15]; and also [16, Theorem 4.1]), it follows that the representation π_f identifies with

$$\pi_{f_1} \oplus \pi_{f_2} \colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2}),$$

with the cyclic unit vector

$$\xi_f^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{2f_1}^0, \xi_{2f_2}^0).$$

We shall consider the orthogonal projection

$$\tilde{e}_1^A \colon H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2} \to H_{f_1} \oplus \{0\}$$

and

$$\tilde{e}_2^A\colon H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_1} \to \{0\} \oplus H_{f_2},$$

for which we have $\tilde{e}_1^A, \tilde{e}_2^A \in \pi_f(A)'$. With an obvious notation we have

$$\tilde{e}_1^A = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{H_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \tilde{e}_2^A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{H_2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We shall also consider the orthogonal projections $e_1^B \in \pi_{f_1}(B)'$ and $e_2^B \in \pi_{f_2}(B)'$, given by

$$\overline{\pi_{f_1}(B)\xi_{2f_1}^0} = e_1^B H_{f_1}, \qquad \overline{\pi_{f_2}(B)\xi_{2f_2}^0} = e_2^B H_{f_2}.$$

Then we shall have

$$\overline{\pi_f(B)\left(\xi_{2f_1}^0, 0\right)} = \begin{pmatrix} e_1^B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} (H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2})$$

and

$$\overline{\pi_f(B)\left(0, \xi_{2f_2}^0\right)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2^B \end{pmatrix} (H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2})$$

Since $(2f_1)|_B = (2f_2)|_B = f|_B$, there exists a uniquely determined partial isometry

$$v\colon H_{f_1} \to H_{f_2},$$

such that

$$v\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 = \pi_{f_2}(b)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \text{ for } b \in B,$$

and $v^*v = e_1^B, vv^* = e_2^B$. The orthogonal projection $e_B \in \pi_f(B)'$ is given by

$$\overline{\pi_f(B)\xi_f^0} = e_B(H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2}).$$

We shall have $v\pi_{f_1}(b) = \pi_{f_2}(b)v$ for $b \in B$.

Proposition 2.2. *We have*

$$e_B = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e_1^B & v^* \\ v & e_2^B \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. (a) For any $b \in B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e_1^B & v^* \\ v & e_2^B \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \\ \pi_{f_2}(b)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \end{pmatrix} &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e_1^B\pi_{f_1}\xi_{2f_1}^0 + v^*\pi_{f_2}(b)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \\ v\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 + e_2^B\pi_{f_2}(b)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 2\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \\ 2\pi_{f_2}(b)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \\ \pi_{f_2}(b)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

and this shows that

$$e_B \leq \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e_1^B & v^* \\ v & e_2^B \end{pmatrix}.$$

(b) Conversely, assume that $e_B(\xi_1,\xi_2)=0$. Then we have

$$\big(\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi^0_{2f_1}\mid\xi_1\big)+\big(\pi_{f_2}(b)\xi^0_{2f_2}\mid\xi_2\big)=0,$$

for any $b\in B$, and this gives that

$$\big(\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi^0_{2f_1}\mid\xi_1\big)+\big(v\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi^0_{2f_1}\mid\xi_2\big)=0 \text{ for } b\in B;$$

therefore,

$$\big(\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi^0_{2f_1}\mid\xi_1+v^*\xi_2\big)=0 \text{ for } b\in B.$$

It follows that

$$e^B_1(\xi_1+v^*\xi_2)=0,$$

and this implies that

$$e^B_1\xi_1+v^*\xi_2=0.$$

We immediately obtain that

$$v\xi_1+e^B_2\xi_2=0,$$

and this gives

$$\frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e^B_1 & v^* \\ v & e^B_2\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\xi_1\\ \xi_2\end{pmatrix}=0.$$

The Proposition is proved.

□

2.3. Let now μ_1,μ_2 be two Radon probability measures on $S(A)$, such that their barycenters be

$$b(\mu_1)=2f_1,\qquad b(\mu_2)=2f_2.$$

Let $\mu=\frac{1}{2}(\mu_1+\mu_2)$. Then

$$b(\mu)=f.$$

Let $K_{\mu_1}\colon L^\infty(\mu_1)\to\pi_{f_1}(A)'$, $K_{\mu_2}\colon L^\infty(\mu_2)\to\pi_{f_2}(A)'$ and

$$K_\mu\colon L^\infty(\mu)\to\pi_f(A)'$$

be the associated Tomita mappings, given by

$$\int_{S(A)}\varphi\lambda_A(A)d\mu_1=\big(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi)\pi_{f_1}(a)\xi^0_{2f_1}\mid\xi^0_{2f_1}\big)\ \text{ for } a\in A$$

$$\int_{S(A)}\varphi\lambda_A(A)d\mu_2=\big(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)\pi_{f_2}(a)\xi^0_{2f_2}\mid\xi^0_{2f_2}\big)\ \text{ for } a\in A, \text{ and}$$

$$\int_{S(A)}\varphi\lambda_A(A)d\mu=\big(K_{\mu}(\varphi)\pi_{f}(a)\xi^0_{f}\mid\xi^0_{f}\big)\ \text{ for } a\in A,$$

where $\lambda_A(a)\colon S(A)\to\mathbb{C}$ is given by

$$\lambda_A(a)(f)=f(a) \text{ for } a\in A, f\in S(A).$$

It follows that, for $a \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(K_\mu(\varphi)\pi_f(a)\xi_f^0 \mid \xi_f^0\right) &= \int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(a)d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(a)d\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(a)d\mu_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi)\pi_{f_1}(a)\xi_{f_1}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_1}^0\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)\pi_{f_2}(a)\xi_{f_2}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_2}^0\right) \\ &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} K_{\mu_1}(\varphi) & 0 \\ 0 & K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\pi_{f_1}(a) & 0 \\ 0 & \pi_{f_2}(a)\end{pmatrix}\xi_f^0 \mid \xi_f^0\right),\end{aligned}$$

and this shows that

$$K_\mu(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} K_{\mu_1}(\varphi) & 0 \\ 0 & K_{\mu_2}\end{pmatrix}$$

for any bounded Borel measurable function $\varphi\colon S(A) \to \mathbb{C}$.

2.4. We shall characterize now the closure of the vector space $\lambda_A(B)$ in $L^1(\mu)$. Let $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mu)$ be such that

$$\int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(b)d\mu = 0 \text{ for } b \in B; \tag{3}$$

without loss of generality, we can assume that $\overline{\varphi} = \varphi$ and $\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq 1$.

From eq. (2) we infer that

$$e_B K_\mu(\varphi)e_B = 0,$$

and this, with Proposition 2.2, gives

$$e_1^B K_{\mu_1}(\varphi)e_1^B + v^* K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)v = 0, \tag{4}$$

$$e_1^B K_{\mu_1}(\varphi)v + v^* K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)e^B = 0, \tag{5}$$

$$vK_{\mu_1}(\varphi)e_1^B + e_2^B K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)v = 0, \text{ and} \tag{6}$$

$$vK_{\mu_1}(\varphi)v^* + e_2^B K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)e^B = 0. \tag{7}$$

Of course, any of these four equalities implies the othes three. We shall show that (any of) these equalities implies that the operators $K_{\mu_1}(\varphi)$ and $K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)$ are scalar.

Indeed, let $\varphi_1\colon S(A) \to \mathbb{C}$ and $\varphi_2\colon S(A) \to \mathbb{C}$ be two bounded Borel measurable functions. We shall prove now

Proposition 2.3. *If*

$$e_1^B K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)e_1^B = v^* K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)v, \tag{8}$$

then there is an $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ *such that*

$$K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1) = \alpha \cdot 1_{H_1} \textit{ and } K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2) = \alpha \cdot 2_{H_2}.$$

Proof. We have

$$e_1^B K_{\mu_1}(\overline{\varphi_1}) e_1^B = v^* K_{\mu_2}(\overline{\varphi_2}) v$$

and

$$e_1^B K_{\mu_1}(\alpha \cdot 1 + \beta\varphi_1) e_1^B = v^* K_{\mu_2}(\alpha \cdot 1 + \beta\varphi_2) v,$$

for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. It follows that we can assume that $0 \leq \varphi_1 \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \varphi_2 \leq 1$.

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} f_1'(a) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\pi_{f_1}(a)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_1}^0\right) \text{ for } a \in A, \text{ and} \\ f_2'(a) &= \frac{2}{2}\left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\pi_{f_2}(a)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_2}^0\right) \text{ for } a \in A, \end{aligned}$$

We shall have $f_1' \in A^*, f_2' \in A^*$ and

$$0 \leq f_1' \leq f_1, \qquad 0 \leq f_2' \leq f_2.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} f_1'(b) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_1}^0\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(e_1^B K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1) e_1^B \pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_1}^0\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(v^* K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2) v \pi_{f_1}(b)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_1}^0\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\pi_{f_2}(b)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_2}^0\right) \\ &= f_2'(b) \text{ for } b \in B; \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $f_1'|_B = f_2'|_B$. If we define

$$\begin{aligned} f_1'' &= f_1 - f_1', \\ f_2'' &= f_2 - f_2', \end{aligned}$$

then f_1'' and f_2'' are positive linear functionals on A, such that $f_1''|_B = f_2''|_B$.

It follows that we have the decomposition

$$f_0 = f_1 - f_2 = \left(f_1' - f_2'\right) + \left(f_1'' - f_2''\right). \tag{9}$$

After an evaluation of the norm, we shall compare the decomposition in eq. (9) with the fact that $f_0 \in \operatorname{ex} N$.

First of all, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1' - f_2'\| \leq \|f_1'\| &= \|f_2'\| \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_1}^0\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi_{2f_2}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_2}^0\right) \\ &= \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_1}^0\right) \\ &= \left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi_{2f_2}^0\right), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where we have taken into account eq. (8).

We shall consider now the weak operator continuous "extensions" of f_1' and f_2' to $\pi_f(A)''$, given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_1'(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)x'\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) \text{ and} \\ F_2'(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)x''\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} x' & 0 \\ 0 & x'' \end{pmatrix} \in \pi_f(A)'',$$

and the weak operator continuous "extension" of f_0 to $\pi_f(A)''$ is given by

$$F_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(x'\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) - \left(x''\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)\right],$$

for any $x \in \pi_f(A)''$. We have $f_0 = F_0 \circ \pi_f$.

From [14, p. 31], it follows that there exists a projection $p \in \pi_f(A)''$ of the form

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} p' & 0 \\ 0 & p'' \end{pmatrix},$$

where $p' \in \pi_{f_1}(A)''$ and $p'' \in \pi_{f_2}(A)''$ are projections, such that

$$F_0(2p-1) = 1.$$

This will give

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= F_0(2p-1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left((2p'-1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left((2P''-1)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \\ &= \|p'\xi^0_{2f_1}\|^2 - \|p''\xi^0_{2f_2}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

from which we immediately infer that

$$p'\xi^0_{2f_1} = \xi^0_{2f_1}, \qquad p''\xi^0_{2f_2} = 0.$$[1]

With the Density Theorem of Kaplansky, we shall have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1' - f_2'\| &= \|F_1' - F_2'\| \\ &\geq (F_1' - F_2')(2p-1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \\ &= \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) \\ &= \left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

From eqs. (10) and (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1' - f_2'\| &= \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) \\ &= \left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

---

[1] See Section 3.3 for another proof of this result.

Similary, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1'' - f_2''\| &= 1 - \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) \\ &= 1 - \left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

From eqs. (9), (12) and (13), because $f_0 \in \operatorname{ex} N$, we immediately infer that

$$f_1' - f_2' = \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right)(f_1 - f_2) \text{ and} \tag{14}$$

$$f_1'' - f_2'' = \left[1 - K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right](f_1 - f_2). \tag{15}$$

Since we have that

$$\|f_1' - f_2'\| = \|f_1'\| + \|f_2'\| \text{ and} \tag{16}$$

$$\|f_1'' - f_2''\| = \|f_1''\| + \|f_2''\|, \tag{17}$$

from eqs. (16) and (17), and from the uniqueness of the Jordan-Hahn-Grothendieck decomposition, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f_1' &= \lambda f_1, & f_2' &= \lambda f_2, \\ f_1'' &= (1-\lambda) f_1, & f_2'' &= (1-\lambda) f_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\lambda = \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) = \left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right).$$

From the uniqueness of the representation of the dominated positive linear functionals, we obtain that

$$K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1) = \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) 1_{H_1},$$

and

$$K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2) = \left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) 2_{H_2},$$

as scalar operators in $\mathcal{L}(H_{f_1})$, respectively in $\mathcal{L}(H_{f_2})$. The Proposition is proved. □

Under the assumptions of thef preceding Proposition, assume moreover that the measures μ_1 and μ_2 are simplicial. Then the Tomita mappings K_{μ_1} and K_{μ_2} are injective (see [16, Proposition 3.1, ii]). It follows that

$$\varphi_1 = \alpha \cdot 1, \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_1) \text{ and} \tag{18}$$

$$\varphi_2 = \alpha \cdot 1, \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_2), \tag{19}$$

with $\alpha = \Big(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\Big) = \Big(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi_2)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\Big)$.

2.5. Let us now return to eqs. (4) to (7). From Proposition 2.3 it follows that if the measures μ_1 and μ_2 are simplicial, then

$$\varphi = \alpha \cdot 1, \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_1) \text{ and} \tag{20}$$

$$\varphi = -\alpha \cdot 1, \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_2), \tag{21}$$

where

$$\alpha = \left(K_{\mu_1}(\varphi)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) = -\left(K_{\mu_2}(\varphi)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right).$$

We can prove now the following Proposition.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume that the measures μ_1 and μ_2 are simplicial. Then the following are equivalent:*

(a) *The measures μ_1 and μ_2 are disjoint;*
(b) *The subspace $\lambda_A(B)$ is not dense in $L^1(\mu)$.*

Proof. ((a) $\Rightarrow$ (b)). If the measures μ_1 and μ_2 are disjoint, then there exists a (bounded) Borel measurable function $\varphi\colon S(A) \to R$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi = 1 \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_1), \text{ and} \\ &\varphi = -1 \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(b)d\mu &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(b)d\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(b)d\mu_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(b)d\mu_1 - \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(b)d\mu_2 \\ &= f_1(b) - f_2(b) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for any $b \in B$. This shows that $\lambda_A(B)$ is not dense in $L^1(\mu)$.

((b) $\Rightarrow$ (a)). If $\lambda_A(B)$ is not dense in $L^1(\mu)$, then there exists a function $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mu)$, such that $\overline{\varphi} = \varphi$, $\|\varphi\|_\infty = 1$, and

$$\int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(b)d\mu = 0 \text{ for } b \in B.$$

From eqs. (20) and (21) it follows that $|\alpha| = 1$, and $\varphi = \pm 1$ in $L^\infty(\mu_1)$, and $\varphi = \mp 1$ in $L^\infty(\mu_2)$. It follows that μ_1 and μ_2 are disjoint. The Proposition is proved. ☐

We can prove now the following Proposition.

Proposition 2.5. *If the measures μ_1 and μ_2 have barycenters $b(\mu_1) = 2f_1$ and $b(\mu_2) = 2f_2$ and if they are simplicial, then they are disjoint.*

Proof. Assume that the measures μ_1, μ_2 are simplicial and not disjoint. Then, by Proposition 2.4, the subspace $\lambda_A(B)$ is dense in $L^1(\mu)$. It follows that for any $\psi \in L^1(\mu)$ there exists a sequence $(b_n)_{n\geq 0}$ in B, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S(A)} |\lambda_A(b_n) - \psi| d\mu = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S(A)} |\lambda_A(b_n) - \psi| d\mu_1 = 0 \text{ and} \\ &\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S(A)} |\lambda_A(b_n) - \psi| d\mu_2 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(b_n)d\mu_1 = \int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(b_n)d\mu_2, \qquad n \geq 0,$$

it follows that

$$\int_{S(A)} \psi d\mu_1 = \int_{S(A)} \psi d\mu_2,$$

for any $\psi \in L^1(\mu)$. In particular, we have

$$\int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(a)d\mu_1 = \int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(a)d\mu_2,$$

for any $a \in A$, and this gives $f_1(a) = f_2(a)$, for any $a \in A$. It follows that $f_0 = 0$, contrary to the assumption. The Proposition is proved. □

Remark 2.6. Below we shall prove that the condition that the measures μ_1 and μ_2 be simplicial can be dropped.

Proposition 2.7. *If the measures μ_1 and μ_2 are simplicial, then a function $\varphi \in L^1(\mu)$ belongs to the closure $\overline{\lambda_A(B)}$ of $\lambda_A(B)$ in $L^1(\mu)$ if and only if*

$$\int_{S(A)} \varphi d\mu_1 = \int_{S(A)} \varphi d\mu_2.$$

Proof. If $\varphi \in \overline{\lambda_A(B)}$, then there exists a sequence (b_n) in B, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S(A)} |\lambda_A(b_n) - \varphi| d\mu = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S(A)} |\lambda_A(b_n) - \varphi| d\mu_1 = 0 \text{ and} \tag{22}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S(A)} |\lambda_A(b_n) - \varphi| d\mu_2 = 0. \tag{23}$$

Since

$$\int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(b_n)d\mu_1 = \int_{S(A)} \lambda_A(b_n)d\mu_2, \qquad n \geq 0,$$

from eqs. (22) and (23) we infer that

$$\int_{S(A)} \varphi d\mu_1 = \int_{S(A)} \varphi d\mu_2. \tag{24}$$

Conversely, if eq. (24) holds for a function $\varphi \in L^1(\mu)$, then we have

$$\int_{S(A)} \psi\varphi d\mu = 0,$$

for any $\psi \in L^\infty(\mu)$, such that

$$\int_{S(A)} \psi\lambda_A(b)d\mu = 0, \qquad b \in B. \tag{25}$$

Indeed, from eq. (25) it follows that

$$\psi = \alpha \cdot 1 \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_1), \text{ and}$$
$$\psi = -\alpha \cdot 1 \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_2),$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.

If follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{S(A)} \psi\varphi d\mu &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \psi\varphi d\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{S(A)} \psi\varphi d\mu_2 \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_{S(A)} \varphi d\mu_1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_{S(A)} \varphi d\mu_2 \\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

and this implies that $\varphi \in \overline{\lambda_A(B)}$.

The Proposition is proved.

□

Proposition 2.8. *For any $i = 1, 2$, if the measure μ_i is simplicial, then $\lambda_A(B)$ is dense in $L^1(\mu_i)$.*

Proof. We can assume that both measures μ_1 and μ_2 are simplicial. Let $\varphi \colon S(A) \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded Borel measurable function, such that

$$\int_{S(A)} \varphi\lambda_A(b) d\mu_1 = 0, \qquad b \in B.$$

From Proposition 2.5 we infer that there exists a Borel measurable subset $D \subset S(A)$, such that

$$\mu_1(D) = 1, \qquad \mu_2(D) = 0.$$

Then we have

$$\int_{S(A)} \chi_D \varphi\lambda_A(b) d\mu = 0, \qquad b \in B,$$

and, therefore,

$$\chi_D\varphi = \alpha \cdot 1 \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_1), \text{ and}$$
$$\chi_D\varphi = -\alpha \cdot 1 \text{ in } L^\infty(\mu_2).$$

It follows that $\alpha = 0$, and, therefore, $\varphi = \chi_D\varphi = 0$ in $L^\infty(\mu_1)$. Similar proof for μ_2. The Proposition is proved. □

2.6. Let us now consider the restriction mapping $r \colon S(A) \to S(B)$. It is an affine continuous surjective mapping of the compact convex set $S(A)$ onto the compact convex set $S(B)$.

We shall consider the direct images

$$\nu = r_*(\mu), \qquad \nu_1 = r_*(\mu_1), \qquad \nu_2 = r_*(\mu_2),$$

as Radon measures on $S(B)$. We shall have

$$\nu = \frac{1}{2}(\nu_1 + \nu_2) \tag{26}$$

and

$$b(\nu) = b(\nu_1) = b(\nu_2) = r(f) = r(2f_1) = r(2f_2).$$

We prove now

Proposition 2.9. *For any $i = 1, 2$, if μ_i is simplicial, then*

(a) *ν_i is simplicial, and*

(b) *the composition mapping $r_p^*\colon L^p(\nu_1) \to L^p(\mu_1)$, given by*

$$r_p^*(\psi) = \psi \circ r, \qquad \psi \in L^p(\nu_1),$$

is an isomorphism of Banach spaces, for any $p \in [1, +\infty]$.

Proof. (a). With an obvious notation, we have to prove that $\lambda_B(B)$ is dense in $L^1(\nu_i)$. If $\psi \in L^\infty(\nu_i)$ is such that

$$\int_{S(B)} \psi \lambda_B(b) d\nu_i = 0, \qquad b \in B,$$

then

$$\int_{S(A)} (\psi \circ r) \lambda_A(b) d\mu_i = 0, \qquad b \in B,$$

and Proposition 2.8 implies that $\psi \circ r = 0$ in $L^\infty(\mu_i)$. It follows that

$$\psi = 0 \text{ in } L^\infty(\nu_i).$$

(b). Since

$$r_1^*(\lambda_B(B)) = \lambda_A(B) \subset r_1^*(L^1(\nu_i)) \subset L^1(\mu_i),$$

from Proposition 2.8 we infer that

$$r_1^*(L^1(\nu_i)) = L^1(\mu_i).$$

From [18, Theorem 12], we infer that r_p^* is an isomorphism of Banach spaces, for any $p \in [1, +\infty]$. □

2.7. For any $i = 1, 2$, we shall identify the representation $\pi_{r(f_i)}$ with

$$\pi_{r(f_i)}\colon B \to \mathcal{L}(e_i^B H_i),$$

given by

$$\pi_{r(f_i)}(b) = \pi_{f_i}(b) e_i^B, \qquad b \in B,$$

with the cyclic vector $\xi_{2f_i}^0$, whereas $\pi_{r(f)}$ will be identified with

$$\pi_{r(f)}\colon B \to \mathcal{L}(e_B(H_1 \oplus H_2)),$$

given by

$$\pi_{r(f)}(b) = \pi_f(b) e_B, \qquad b \in B,$$

with the cyclic vector ξ_f^0, although

$$r(f) = r(2f_1) = r(2f_2).$$

Proposition 2.10. *For any $i = 1, 2$, if μ_i is simplicial, then*

(a) *$K_{\nu_i}(L^\infty(\nu_i)) = e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(L^\infty(\mu_i)) e_i^B$, and*

(b) *the mapping*

$$\pi_{f_i}(A)' \ni x \mapsto e_i^B x e_i^B \in \pi_{r(f_i)}(B)'$$

is injective.

Proof. (a). For any $\psi \in L^\infty(\nu_i)$, we have

$$\int_{S(B)} \psi \lambda_B(b) d\nu_i = \int_{S(B)} (\psi \circ r)\lambda_A(b) d\mu_1, \qquad b \in B,$$

and this shows that

$$\left(K_{\nu_i}(\psi)\pi_{f_i}(b)\xi^0_{2f_i} \mid \xi^0_{2f_i}\right) = \left(K_{\mu_i}(\psi \circ r)\pi_{f_i}(b)\xi^0_{2f_i}(b)\xi^0_{2f_i} \mid \xi^0_{2f_i}\right),$$

for any $b \in B$.

It follows that

$$K_{\nu_i}(\psi) = e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(\psi \circ r) e_i^B, \tag{27}$$

and this implies that

$$K_{\nu_i}(L^\infty(\nu_i)) \subset e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(L^\infty(\mu_1)) e_i^B.$$

Let now $x \in K_{\mu_i}(L^\infty(\mu_i))$; then there is a $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mu_i)$ such that $K_{\mu_i}(\varphi) = x$. From Proposition 2.9 (b), we infer that there is a $\psi \in L^\infty(\nu_i)$, such that $\varphi = \psi \circ r$. From eq. (27) we obtain

$$e_i^B x e_i^B = e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(\varphi) e_i^B = e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(\psi \circ r) e_i^B = K_{\nu_i}(\psi) \in K_{\nu_i}(L^\infty(\nu_i)),$$

and this shows that

$$e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(L^\infty(\mu_i)) e_i^B \subset K_{\nu_i}(L^\infty(\nu_i)).$$

(b). We have to prove that $x \in \pi_{f_i}(A)'$ and

$$e_i^B x e_i^B = 0$$

implies that $x = 0$. It will be enough to prove that $x \in \pi_{f_i}(A)'$, $x^* = x$ and $e_i^B x e_i^B = 0$ implies that $x = 0$.

Let then $c_i \subset \pi_{f_i}(A)'$ be any abelian von Neumann subalgebra, such that $x \in C_i$ and let μ_i be the corresponding orthogonal measure on $S(A)$, such that $b(\mu_i) = 2f_i$ and $K_{\mu_i}(L^\infty(\mu_i)) = C_i$.

Then μ_i is simplicial (see [16, Theorem 3.1, Corollary 1]), and, therefore, ν_i is simplicial, by Proposition 2.9 (a). It follows that K_{ν_i} is injective (see [16, Proposition 3.1]). Since $x \in C_i$, there is a $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mu_i)$ such that $K_{\mu_i}(\varphi) = x$. By Proposition 2.9 (b), there is a $\psi \in L^\infty(\nu_i)$, such that $\psi \circ r = \varphi$. It follows that

$$0 = e_i^B x e_i^B = e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(\varphi) e_i^B = e_i^B K_{\mu_i}(\psi \circ r) e_i^B = K_{\nu_i}(\psi),$$

and these equalities imply that $\psi = 0$, because K_{ν_i} is injective. It follows that $\varphi = 0$, and, therefore, $x = 0$. The Proposition is proved. □

2.8. From eq. (26) we obtain

$$2\nu = \nu_1 + \nu_2,$$

and this, by the Radon-Nikodym Theorem, implies that there exist Borel measurable functions

$$d_i\colon S(B) \to [0,2], \qquad i = 1,2,$$

such that

$$\nu_1 = d_1\nu, \qquad \nu_2 = d_2\nu, \text{ and } d_1 + d_2 = 2.$$

Since $b(\nu) = b(\nu_1) = b(\nu_2)$, we infer that

$$\int_{S(B)} \lambda_B(b) d\nu_1 = \int_{S(B)} \lambda_B(b) d\nu_2 = \int_{S(B)} \lambda_B(b) d\nu, \qquad b \in B,$$

and this gives

$$\int_{S(B)} (1 - d_i)\lambda_B(b) d\nu = 0, \qquad b \in B, i = 1,2.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{S(A)} (1 - d_i \circ r)\lambda_A(b) d\mu = 0, \qquad b \in B, i = 1,2. \tag{28}$$

Assuming that the measures μ_1 and μ_2 are simplicial, from eq. (28) and from the results obtained in Section 2.5, it follows that there are Borel Measurable sets $E_1, E_2 \subset S(A)$, such that $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$, $E_1 \cup E_2 = S(A)$, and

$$\mu_1(E_1) = \mu_2(E_2) = 1, \qquad \mu_1(E_2) = \mu_2(E_1) = 0,$$

and real numbers α_1, α_2, such that

$$1 - d_i \circ r = \alpha_i(\chi_{E_1} - \chi_{E_2}), \qquad i = 1,2.$$

It follows that

$$d_i \circ r = (1 - \alpha_i)\chi_{E_1} + (1 + \alpha_i)\chi_{E_2}, \qquad i = 1,2. \tag{29}$$

Since $d_1 \circ r + d_2 \circ r = 2$, it follows that

$$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0. \tag{30}$$

We shall show that the sets E_1 and E_2 can be chosen to be independent of the measures μ_1 and μ_2, assumed to be simplicial.

Indeed, let us consider again the projection p, introduced in Section 2.4. Since we have

$$p(\xi^0_{2f_1}, 0) = (\xi^0_{2f_1}, 0) \text{ and} \tag{31}$$

$$p(0, \xi^0_{2f_2}) = (0, 0), \tag{32}$$

from [11, Lemma 2.4.2], we infer that there exists a $y \in \big((\pi_f(A)'_+)_\sigma\big)_\delta$, such that

$$y(1 - p)(\xi^0_{2f_1}, 0) = y(1 - p)(0, \xi^0_{2f_2}) = (0, 0),$$

and

$$(1 - y)p(\xi^0_{2f_1}, 0) = (1 - y)p(0, \xi^0_{2f_2}) = (0, 0).$$

It follows that

$$y\left(\xi^0_{2f_1},0\right)=\left(\xi^0_{2f_1},0\right)\ \text{and}$$
$$y\left(0,\xi^0_{2f_2}\right)=(0,0).$$

Since y belongs to the Baire enveloping C^*-algebra of $\pi_f(B)$ in $\mathcal{L}(H)$, from [11, Theorem 4.5.9] it follows that there exists a z in the Baire enveloping C^*-algebra of A in A^{**}, such that $0\le z\le 1$ and $\tilde{\pi}_f(z)=y$, where $\tilde{\pi}_f$ is the normal extension of π_f.

Let $\lambda_A(z)\colon S(A)\to[0,1]$ be the Kadison functional representation of z. As in [24] (see also [11, Corollary 4.5.13] and [17]) one can show that the barycentric calculus holds for $\tilde{\lambda}_A(z)$, and this implies that

$$\int_{S(A)}\tilde{\lambda}_A(z)d\mu_1=1\ \text{and}\ \int_{S(A)}\tilde{\lambda}_A(z)d\mu_2=0, \tag{33}$$

for any Radon probability measures μ_1,μ_2 on $S(A)$, such that

$$b(\mu_1)=2f_1,\qquad b(\mu_2)=2f_2.$$

As above, let

$$\mu=\frac{1}{2}(\mu_1+\mu_2),$$

and define

$$E_1=\{x\in S(A);\tilde{x}(z)=1\},\qquad E_2=\complement E_1$$

and

$$E_0=\{x\in S(A);\tilde{x}(z)=0\},$$

where $\tilde{x}$ is the normal extension of x. Then we have that

$$\mu_1(E_1)=1,\qquad \mu_1(E_2)=0,\qquad \mu_2(E_1)=0$$

and

$$\mu_2(E_2)=\mu_2(E_0)=1.$$

Let us define

$$u=2z-1.$$

We have the following

Proposition 2.11. *$\tilde{\lambda}_A(u)=\chi_{E_1}-\chi_{E_2}$ in $L^1(\mu)$.*

Proof. We have

$$\int_{S(A)}|\tilde{\lambda}_A(u)-(\chi_{E_1}-\chi_{E_2})|d\mu_1=\int_{S(A)}|\chi_{E_1}\tilde{\lambda}_A(u)-\chi_{E_1}|d\mu_1=0$$

and

$$\int_{S(A)}|\tilde{\lambda}_A(u)-(\chi_{E_1}-\chi_{E_2})|d\mu_2=\int_{S(A)}|\chi_{E_1}\tilde{\lambda}_A(u)-\chi_{E_1}|d\mu_2=0$$

and the Proposition is proved. ☐

2.9. Let us now return to eq. (29). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
1-\alpha_1 &= \int_{S(A)} (d_1\circ r)d\mu_1\\
&= \int_{S(B)} d_1 d\nu_1\\
&= \int_{S(B)} d_1^2 d\nu\\
&= \int_{S(A)} (d_1\circ r)^2 d\mu\\
&= \int_{S(A)} [(1-\alpha_1)^2\chi_{S_1} + (1+\alpha_1)^2\chi_{E_2}]d\mu\\
&= \frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha_1)^2\\
&= 1+\alpha_1^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
2-\alpha_2 &= \int_{S(A)} (d_2\circ r)d\mu_2\\
&= \int_{S(B)} d_2 d\nu_2\\
&= \int_{S(B)} d_2^2 d\nu\\
&= \int_{S(A)} (d_2\circ r)^2 d\mu\\
&= \int_{S(A)} [(1-\alpha_2)^2\chi_{S_2} + (1+\alpha_2)^2\chi_{E_2}]d\mu\\
&= \frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha_2)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha_2)^2\\
&= 1+\alpha_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

The system of equations

$$\alpha_1+\alpha_2=0, \qquad \alpha_1^2+\alpha_1=0, \qquad \alpha_2^2-\alpha_2=0$$

has the solutions

(a) $\alpha_1=\alpha_2=0$, and
(b) $\alpha_1=-1, \alpha_2=1$.

We prove now

Proposition 2.12. *Case (a) holds for the simplicial Radon probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 if and only if we have*

$$\mu_1=\varepsilon_{2f_1} \text{ and } \mu_2=\varepsilon_{2f_2}. \tag{34}$$

Proof. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$, then $d_1 \circ r = d_2 \circ r = 1$ and, therefore, $\nu = \nu_1 = \nu_2$. It follows that for any bounded Borel measurable function $\psi \colon S(B) \to \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\int_{S(B)} \psi \lambda_B(b) d\nu_1 = \int_{S(B)} \psi \lambda_B(b) d\nu_2, \qquad b \in B,$$

and this gives

$$\int_{S(A)} (\psi \circ r) \lambda_A(b) d\mu_1 = \int_{S(A)} (\psi \circ r) \lambda_A(b) d\mu_2, \qquad b \in B.$$

It follows that

$$\left(K_{\mu_1}(\psi \circ r) \pi_{f_1}(b) \xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1} \right) = \left(K_{\mu_2}(\psi \circ r) \pi_{f_2}(b) \xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2} \right),$$

for any $b \in B$. We infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(e^B_1 K_{\mu_1}(\psi \circ r) e^B_1 \pi_{f_1}(b) \xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1} \right) &= \left(e^B_2 K_{\mu_2}(\psi \circ r) e^B_2 \pi_{f_2}(b) \xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2} \right) \\ &= \left(e^B_2 K_{\mu_2}(\psi \circ r) v \pi_{f_1}(b) \xi^0_{2f_1} \mid v \xi^0_{2f_1} \right) \\ &= \left(v^* K_{\mu_2}(\psi \circ r) v \pi_{f_1}(b) \xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1} \right), b \in B. \end{aligned}$$

This immediately gives that

$$e^B_1 K_{\mu_1}(\psi \circ r) e^B_1 = v^* K_{\mu_2}(\psi \circ r) v, \qquad \psi \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\nu). \tag{35}$$

From Proposition 2.3, we infer that $\psi \circ r = \alpha \cdot 1$ in $L^\infty(\mu_i)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\nu)$, and any $i = 1, 2$. From Proposition 2.9 (b), we infer that $\mu_1 = \varepsilon_{2f_1}$ and $\mu_2 = \varepsilon_{2f_2}$.

Conversely if eq. (34) holds, then $\nu = \nu_1 = \nu_2$ and $d_1 = d_2 = 1$.

The Proposition is proved. ☐

Let us now assume that case (b) holds. Then we have that

$$d_1 \circ r = 2\chi_{E_1}, \text{ and} \tag{36}$$

$$d_2 \circ r = 2\chi_{E_2}. \tag{37}$$

We can prove now

Proposition 2.13. *If case (b) holds for the simplicial Radon probability measures μ_1 and μ_2, then the measures ν_1 and ν_2 are disjoint and $d_1 d_2 = 0$.*

Proof. From eqs. (36) and (37) it follows that $(d_1 \circ r)(d_2 \circ r) = 0$ on $S(A)$. Since r is surjective, it follows that $d_1 d_2 = 0$, and this shows that the measures ν_1 and ν_2 are disjoint. ☐

Remark 2.14. Equation (35) shows that any pair μ_1, μ_2 of Radon probability measures on $S(A)$, such that

$$b(\mu_1) = 2f_1, b(\mu_2) = 2f_2,$$

is disjoint. This strengthens Proposition 2.5.

3. Separation of the Set of the Pure States

In this part we shall extend to the general, possibly non-separable, case two theorems obtained by Anderson and Bunce (see [2]) for separable C^*-algebras, under the weaker assumption, corresponding to Conjecture 1.1, that B separates $P(A)$. We shall also obtain some auxiliary results for the proof of the general Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, which will be given in the third part, among which a "Separation Theorem" for representations will play an essential role.

3.1. Let $f \in S(A)$ and let $C \subset \pi_f(A)'$ be an abelian von Neumann subalgebra of the commutant $\pi_f(A)'$ of $\pi_f(A)$.

Let us define

$$A_C = C^*(\pi_f(A), C), \qquad B_C = C^*(\pi_f(B), C);$$

i.e., A_C is the C^*-algebra generated in $\mathcal{L}(H_f)$ by $\pi_f(A)$ and C, whereas B_C is the C^*-algebra generated in $\mathcal{L}(H_f)$ by $\pi_f(B)$ and C. We have

$$A_C' = \pi_f(A)' \cap C', \qquad B_C' = \pi_f(B)' \cap C'.$$

It follows that we have $A_C' = C$ if, and only if, C is a maximal abelian von Neumann rubalgebra of $\pi_f(A)'$.

We can prove now

Proposition 3.1. *If B separates $P(A)$, then B_C separates $P(A_C)$.*

Proof. (a) If $p \in P(A_C)$, then $p \circ \pi_f \in P(A)$. Indeed, we have $\pi_p(A_C) = C^*(\pi_p(\pi_f(A)), \pi_p(C))$, and, therefore,

$$\mathbb{C}\,1 = \pi_p(A_C)' = \pi_p(\pi_f(A))' \cap \pi_p(C)';$$

since $\pi_p(C) \subset \pi_p(A_C)'$, it follows that

$$\pi_p(\pi_f(A))' = \mathbb{C}\,1.$$

It follows that ξ_p^0 is cyclic for $(\pi_p \circ \pi_f))\,(A)$ in $\mathcal{L}(H_p)$ and $\pi_p \circ \pi_f$ can be identified with $\pi_p \circ \pi_f$; hence, $p \circ \pi_f \in P(A)$.

(b) Let now $p, q \in P(A_C)$ be such that $p|_{B_C} = q|_{B_C}$. Let us choose $c \in C$ and define

$$p_c(a) = p(c^*ac), \qquad q_c(a) = q(c^*ac), \qquad a \in A_C.$$

We have

$$p_c(1) = q_c(1).$$

Denoting by γ_c this number, we have $\gamma_c \geq 0$. If $\gamma_c = 0$, then

$$p_c(a) = q_c(a) = 0, \qquad a \in A_C.$$

If $\gamma_c > 0$, then

$$\gamma_c^{-1} p_c \in P(A_C), \qquad \gamma_c^{-1} q_c \in P(A_C),$$

and, therefore,

$$(\gamma_c^{-1} p_c) \circ \pi_f \in P(A), \qquad (\gamma_c^{-1} q_c) \circ \pi_f \in P(A).$$

Since we have that

$$\big((\gamma_c^{-1}p_c)\circ\pi_f\big)\mid B\big)=\big((\gamma_c^{-1}q_c)\circ\pi_f\big)\mid B\big),$$

it follows that

$$(\gamma_c^{-1}p_c)\circ\pi_f=(\gamma_c^{-1}q_c)\circ\pi_f,$$

and this implies that

$$p(c^*\pi_f(a)c)=q(c^*\pi_f(a)c),\qquad a\in A.$$

It follows that the equality holds for any $c\in C$, and any $a\in A$; and, therefore, by linearity and continuity, $p=q$. The Proposition is proved.

□

Corollary 3.2. *If B separates $P(A)$, then the restriction mappings*

$$r\colon S(A)\to S(B)\text{ and }r_C\colon S(A_C)\to S(B_C)$$

are admissible.

Proof. Since B separates $P(A)$, and B_C separates $P(A_C)$, from [7, Proposition 11.1.7] it follows that $r(P(A))\subset P(B)$ and $r_C(P(A_C))\subset P(B_C)$, which means exactly that the mappings r and r_C are admissible (see [19, p. 527]). □

Remark 3.3. Since r and r_C are surjective, it follows that $r(P(A))=P(B)$ and $r_C(P(A_C))=P(B_C)$; therefore, the restrictions

$$\tilde r\colon P(A)\colon P(B),\qquad r_C\colon P(A_C)\to P(B_C)$$

are bijections.

3.2. Let us now assume that $C\subset\pi_f(A)'$ is a maximal abelian von Neumann subalgebra. Let $f_C=\omega_{\xi_f^0}A_C$ be the restriction of the vector state $\omega_{\xi_f^0}$ on $\mathcal{L}(H_f)$ to A_C, and let μ_C be the maximal orthogonal (central) measure on $S(A_C)$, corresponding to the maximal abelian von Neumann subalgebra $C=A'_C$, with the barycenter $b(\mu_C)=f_C$.

Since μ_C is a maximal Radon probability measure on $S(A_C)$, it follows that the direct image $\nu_C=(r_C)_*(\mu_C)$ is a maximal Radon probability measure on $S(B_C)$ (see [19, Theoreme 6].

We have that $\overline{B_C\xi_f^0}=e_CH_f$, where $a_C\in B'_C$ is a projection. It follows that

$$e_C\in C'.$$

From [18, Theorem 19], it follows that the measure ν_C is maximal orthogonal on $S(B_C)$, corresponding to the maximal abelian von Neumann subalgebra

$$Ce_C\subset e_CB'_Ce_C.$$

Since any element of Ce_C commutes with any element of $e_CB'_Ce_C$, it follows that

$$Ce_C=e_CB'_Ce_C. \tag{38}$$

From

$$C \subset \pi_f(A)' \subset \pi_f(B)',$$

it follows that

$$\pi_f(B)'' \subset C',$$

and, therefore,

$$Ce_C = e_C C \supset \left(\pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)''\right) e_C. \tag{39}$$

we have

$$\overline{\pi_f(B)\xi_f^0} = e_B H_f,$$

where $e_B \in \pi_f(B)'$ is a projection. We shall prove now

Proposition 3.4. *If B separates $P(A)$, then for any $z \in \pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)''$ there exists a uniquely determined $c \in \pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)'' \cap \{e_B\}'$, such that $ze_B = ce_B$.*

Proof. From eq. (39) we infer that for any maximal abelian von Neumann subalgebra

$$C \subset \pi_f(A)'$$

there exists a $c \in C$, such that

$$ze_C = e_C z = ce_C = e_C c.$$

(a) The element $c \in C$ is uniquely determined. Indeed, if

$$c_1 e_C = c_2 e_C,$$

then $c_1\xi_f^0 = c_2\xi_f^0$, and this implies that $c_1 = c_2$, because ξ_f^0 is separating for $\pi_f(A)'$.

(b) The element c does not depend on C. Indeed, with an obvious notation, for any two maximal abelian von Neumann subalgebras

$$C_1 \subset \pi_f(A)' \text{ and } C_2 \subset \pi_f(A)',$$

there exist $c_1 \in C_1$ and $c_2 \in C_2$, such that

$$e_{C_1} z = ze_{C_1} = c_1 e_{C_1} = e_{C_1} c_1,$$
$$e_{C_2} z = ze_{C_2} = c_2 e_{C_2} = e_{C_2} c_2.$$

It follows that

$$e_B z = ze_B = c_1 e_B = e_B c_1,$$
$$e_B z = ze_B = c_2 e_B = e_B c_2,$$

because $e_B \leq e_{C_1}, e_B \leq e_{C_2}$. As above, it follows that $c_1 = c_2$, because $c_1, c_2 \in \pi_f(A)'$. It follows that there exists an element $c \in \bigcap C$, such that

$$ze_B = e_B z = ce_B = e_B c.$$

Since $\bigcap C = \pi_f(A)' \cap \pi_f(A)''$, the Proposition is proved.

□

Corollary 3.5. *We have that*

$$\left(\pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)''\right) e_B \subset \left(\pi_f(A)' \cap \pi_f(A)'' \cap \{e_B\}'\right) e_B$$

and the mapping

$$\Phi \colon \pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)'' \to \pi_f(A)' \cap \pi_f(A)'' \cap \{e_B\}',$$

determined by

$$z e_B = \Phi(z) e_B, \qquad z \in \pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)'',$$

is a (*)-homomorphism.

We can prove now the following

Theorem 3.6. *If $1 \in B$ and if B separates $P(A)$, then*

$$r(F(A)) \subset F(B).$$

Proof. For any $f \in F(A)$ we have

$$\pi_f(A)' \cap \pi_f(A)'' = \mathbb{C}\, 1.$$

From Corollary 3.5, we infer that

$$\left(\pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)''\right) e_B = \mathbb{C}\, e_B. \tag{40}$$

Since $\pi_{r(f)}$ can be identified with

$$b \mapsto \pi_f(b) e_B,$$

from eq. (40) we infer that $r(f) \in F(B)$. The Theorem is proved. □

Remark 3.7. Theorem 3.6 is an extension, to the possibly non-separable case, of [2, Corollary 3, p.364].

3.3. Let us now consider the set

$$N = \{f \in A^* \mid f^* = f, \|f\| \leq 1, f|_B = 0\}.$$

It is a compact convex subset of A^*. If $b \neq A$, then $N \neq \{0\}$ and for any $f_0 \in \operatorname{ex} N$, we have

$$\|f_0\| = 1.$$

As above, let $f_0 = f_1 - f_2$ be the Jordan-Hahn-Grothendieck decomposition (see [11, Theorem 3.2.5]). Then

$$\|f_1\| = \|f_2\| = \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$2f_1 \in S(A), \qquad 2f_2 \in S(A), \qquad f_1|_B = f_2|_B.$$

Since $\|f_1 - f_2\| = \|f_1\| + \|f_2\|$, it follows that the states $2f_1$ and $2f_2$ are orthogonal (see [18, Lemma 6]). Let us define

$$f = f_1 + f_2. \tag{41}$$

By a theorem of Godement (see [15] and also [16, Theorem 4.1]), it follows that the representation π_f identifies with

$$\pi_{f_1} \oplus \pi_{f_2} \colon A \to \mathcal{L}\left(H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2}\right),$$

with the cyclic vector

$$\xi_f^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right).$$

Theorem 3.8. *If* $1 \in B$*, if* B *separates* $P(A)$ *and if* $B \neq A$*, then* $\pi_f(B)'' e_B$ *is a factor; i.e.,* $r(f) \in F(B)$*.*

Proof. let $\tilde{e}_1^A \colon H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2} \to H_{f_1} \oplus \{0\}$ and $\tilde{e}_2^A \colon H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2} \to \{0\} \oplus H_{f_2}$ be the corresponding orthogonal projections. We have $\tilde{e}_1^A, \tilde{e}_2^A \in \pi_f(A)'$, and also

$$\overline{\pi_f(B)\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, 0\right)} = \tilde{e}_1^B\left(H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2}\right),$$

$$\overline{\pi_f(B)\left(0, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)} = \tilde{e}_2^B\left(H_{f_1} \oplus H_{f_2}\right),$$

where $\tilde{e}_1^B$ and $\tilde{e}_2^B$ are projections in $\pi_f(B)'$, given by

$$\tilde{e}_1^B = \begin{pmatrix} e_1^B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{e}_2^B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2^B \end{pmatrix}$$

where $e_1^B \in \pi_{f_1}(B)'$ and $e_2^B \in \pi_f(B)'$ are the projections described in Section 2.2.

Of course, we have

$$\tilde{e}_1^B \leq \tilde{e}_1^A \text{ and } \tilde{e}_2^B \leq \tilde{e}_2^A.$$

Let now $e', e'' \in \pi_f(B)' \cap \pi_f(B)''$ be projections such that

$$e' + e'' = 1.$$

Since $f_1|_B = f_2|_B$, there exists a uniquely determined partial isometry $\tilde{v} \in \pi_f(B)'$, such that

$$\tilde{v}\begin{pmatrix} \pi_{f_1}(b)\xi^0_{2f_1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \pi_{f_2}(b)\xi^0_{2f_2} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad b \in B,$$

and $\tilde{v}^*\tilde{v} = e_1^B, \tilde{v}\tilde{v}^* = e_2^B$. Of course, v is of the form

$$\tilde{v} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ v & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $v \colon H_{f_1} \to H_{f_2}$ is the partial isometry described in Section 2.2.

With

$$f_1(a) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_1(a)}\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right), \qquad a \in A,$$

$$f_2(a) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_2(a)}\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right), \qquad a \in A,$$

let us define

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1'(a) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_1}(a)e_1'\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid e_1'\xi^0_{2f_1}\right), && a \in A,\\
f_1''(a) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_1}(a)e_1''\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid e_1''\xi^0_{2f_1}\right), && a \in A,\\
f_2'(a) &= \frac{2}{2}\left(\pi_{f_2}(a)e_2'\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid e_2'\xi^0_{2f_2}\right), && a \in A,\\
f_2''(a) &= \frac{2}{2}\left(\pi_{f_2}(a)e_2''\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid e_2''\xi^0_{2f_2}\right), && a \in A,
\end{aligned}$$

where $e_1', e_1'' \in \pi_{f_1}(B)' \cap \pi_{f_1}(B)''$ and $e_2', e_2'' \in \pi_{f_2}(B)' \cap \pi_{f_2}(B)''$ are projections determined as follows.

Any $\pi_f(a), a \in A$, is of the form

$$\pi_f(a) = \begin{pmatrix} \pi_{f_1}(a) & 0 \\ 0 & \pi_{f_2}(a) \end{pmatrix}$$

and any $a' \in \pi_f(A)'$ is of the form

$$a' = \begin{pmatrix} a'_{11} & a'_{12} \\ a'_{21} & a'_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a'_{ij} \colon H_{f_j} \to H_{f_i}, i = 1, 2$, are linear bounded operators satisfying the conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
a'_{11}\pi_{f_1}(a) &= \pi_{f_1}(a)a'_{11}, && a \in A,\\
a'_{12}\pi_{f_2}(a) &= \pi_{f_1}(a)a'_{12}, && a \in A,\\
a'_{21}\pi_{f_1}(a) &= \pi_{f_2}(a)a'_{21}, && a \in A,\\
a'_{22}\pi_{f_2}(a) &= \pi_{f_2}(a)a'_{22}, && a \in A.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that any $\tilde{z} \in \pi_f(A)' \cap \pi_f(A)''$ is of the form

$$\tilde{z} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$z_1 \in \pi_{f_1}(A)' \cap \pi_{f_1}(A)'', \qquad z_2 \in \pi_{f_2}(A)' \cap \pi_{f_2}(A)''.$$

Similarly, the projections e', e'' are of the form

$$e' = \begin{pmatrix} e_1' & 0 \\ 0 & e_2' \end{pmatrix}, \qquad e'' = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $e_1', e_1'' \in \pi_{f_1}(B)' \cap \pi_{f_1}(B)''$ and $e_2', e_2'' \in \bigcap \pi_{f_2}(B)' \cap \pi_{f_2}(B)''$. It follows that

$$e_1' + e_1'' = 1, \qquad e_2' + e_2'' = 1.$$

By Corollary 3.5, we have *-homomorphisms

$$\Phi_1 \colon \pi_{f_1}(B)' \cap \pi_{f_1}(B)'' \to \pi_{f_1}(A)' \cap \pi_{f_1}(A)'' \cap \{e_i^B\}',$$

such that

$$ze_i^B = \Phi_i(z)e_i^B, \qquad z \in \pi_{f_i}(B)' \cap \pi_{f_i}(B)'', \qquad i = 1, 2.$$

Then we shall have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i'(a) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)e_i'\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid e_i'\xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)e_i'e_i^B\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid e_i'e_i^B\xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)\Phi_i(e_i')e_i^B\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \Phi_i(e_i')e_i^B\xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)\Phi_i(e_i')\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \Phi_i(e_i')\xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)\Phi_i({}_i')\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_i}^0\right), \qquad a \in A, i = 1, 2,
\end{aligned}$$

because $\Phi_i(e_i')$ is a projection in the center of $\pi''_{f_i(A)}$.

Similarly, we have

$$f_i''(a) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)\Phi_i(a_i'')\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_i}^0\right), \qquad a \in A, i = 1, 2.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i'(a) + f_i''(a) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)\Phi_i(e_i' + e_i'')\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)\Phi_i(e_i' + e_i'')e_i^B\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)(e_i' + e_i'')e_i^B\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_i}(a)\xi_{2f_i}^0 \mid \xi_{2f_i}^0\right)\\
&= f_i(a), \qquad a \in A, i = 1, 2.
\end{aligned}$$

For $b \in B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1'(b) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_1}(b)e_1'\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid e_1'\xi_{2f_1}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_1}(b)e_1'v^*v\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid e_1'\xi_{2f_1}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{2f_1}(b)v^*e_2'v\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid e_1'\xi_{2f_1}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(v^*\pi_{f_2}(b)e_2'v\xi_{2f_1}^0 \mid e_1'\xi_{2f_1}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_2}(b)e_2'\xi_{2f_2}^0 \mid ve_1'\xi_{2f_1}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_2}(b)e_2'\xi_{2f_2}^0 \mid e_2'v\xi_{2f_1}^0\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi_{f_2}(b)e_2'\xi_{2f_2}^0 \mid e_2'\xi_{2f_2}^0\right)\\
&= f_2'(b),
\end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$f_1''(b) = f_2''(b), \qquad b \in B.$$

We then have $f_i', f_i'' \in A^*, f_i' \geq 0, f_i'' \geq 0$, for $i = 1, 2$, and

$$f_1 - f_2 = (f_1' - f_2') + (f_1'' - f_2''), \text{ on } A,$$

and also

$$f_1'|_B = f_2'|_B, \qquad f_1''|_B = f_2''|_B.$$

Assume that

$$\|f_1' - f_2'\| > 0, \text{ and} \tag{42}$$

$$\|f_1 - f_2\| > 0. \tag{43}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= f_1 - f_2 \\ &= \|f_1' - f_2'\| \frac{f_1' - f_2'}{\|f_1' - f_2'\|} + \|f_1'' - f_2''\| \frac{f_1'' - f_2''}{\|f_1'' - f_2''\|}. \end{aligned}$$

We have also

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1' - f_2'\| \leq f_1'(1) + f_2'(1) &= \frac{1}{2}\|e_1'\xi^0_{2f_1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|e_2'\xi^0_{2f_2}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|e'\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider the self-adjoint linear functionals

$$F_i \colon \pi_f(A)'' \to \mathbb{C}, \qquad i = 0, 1, 2,$$

given by

$$F_0(a) = F_0\left(\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(a_1\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left(a_2\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \tag{44}$$

$$F_i(a) = F_i\left(\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(a_i\xi^0_{2f_i} \mid \xi^0_{2f_i}\right), i = 1, 2, \tag{45}$$

for

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \pi_f(A)''.$$

We have

$$f_i = F_i \circ \pi_f, \qquad i = 0, 1, 2,$$

and

$$F_0 = F_1 - F_2. \tag{46}$$

Since $F_i, i = 0, 1, 2$, are w_0-continuous, from the Density Theorem of Kaplansky it follows that eq. (46) gives the Jordan-Hahn-Grothendieck decomposition of F_0 and, therefore, there exists a unitary self-adjoint element $u \in \pi_f(A)''$, of the form

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & u_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

such that

$$F_1(a) = F_0(pa) = F_0(ap), \qquad \text{for } a \in \pi_f(A)'', \tag{47}$$

$$F_2(a) = -F_0(p'a) = -F_0(ap'), \qquad \text{for } a \in \pi_f(A)''. \tag{48}$$

Here p and p' are projections in $\pi_f(A)''$, given by

$$u = p - p'', \qquad p + p' = 1.$$

(see [14, p. 31]). Of course, p and p' are of the form

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 & 0 \\ 0 & p_2 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad p' = \begin{pmatrix} p_1' & 0 \\ 0 & p_2' \end{pmatrix},$$

where p_i and p_i' are projections in $\pi_{f_i}(A)''$.

With $e_i = 2p_i - 1$, $i = 1, 2$, we shall have

$$u_1\xi^0_{2f_1} = \xi^0_{2f_1} \tag{49}$$

$$u_2\xi^0_{2f_2} = -\xi^0_{2f_2}. \tag{50}$$

Indeed, from eqs. (44), (45) and (47) we obtain

$$\left((1-p_1)a_1\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) = -\left(p_2a_2\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right), \tag{51}$$

for any $a = \begin{pmatrix} a_2 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \pi_f(A)''$. In particular, for $a = \pi_f(a_0)$, $a_0 \in A$, we obtain from eqs. (49) and (50) that

$$\left((1-p_1)\pi_{f_1}(a_0)\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) = -\left(p_2\pi_{f_2}(a_0)\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \tag{52}$$

holds for any $a_0 \in A$. Because the vector $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)$ is cyclic for the representation π_f, from eq. (52) we obtain that

$$\left((1-p_1)\xi_1 \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) = -\left(p_2\xi_2 \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right),$$

for any $\xi_1 \in H_1$, and any $\xi_2 \in H_2$, and this implies that

$$(1-p_1)\xi^0_{2f_1} = 0 \text{ and } p_2\xi^0_{2f_2} = 0;$$

eqs. (49) and (50) are established.

It follows that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(f_1' - f_2')(u) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(u_1\Phi_1(e_1')\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \Phi_1(e_1')\xi^0_{2f_1}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left(u_2\Phi_2(e_2')\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \Phi_2(e_2')\xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|\Phi_1(e_1')\xi^0_{2f_1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\Phi_2(e_2')\xi^0_{2f_2}\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|e_1'\xi^0_{2f_1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|e_2'\xi^0_{2f_2}\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|e'\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We infer that

$$\|f_1 - f_2\| = \frac{1}{2}\|e'\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)\|^2.$$

Similary, we have

$$\|f_1'' - f_2''\| = \frac{1}{2}\|e''\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)\|^2,$$

and, therefore,

$$\|f_1' - f_2'\| + \|f_1'' - f_2''\| = 1.$$

Since $f_0 \in \operatorname{ex} N$, it follows that

$$\|f_1' - f_2'\|^{-1}(f_1' - f_2') = \|f_1'' - f_2''\|^{-1}(f_1'' - f_2'') = f_0.$$

By the uniqueness of the Jordan-Hahn-Grothendieck decomposition, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= \|f_1' - f_2'\|^{-1} f_1' = \|f_1'' - f_2''\|^{-1} f_1'', \\ f_2 &= \|f_1' - f_2'\|^{-1} f_2' = \|f_1'' - f_2''\|^{-1} f_2''. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1(e_1') &= \Phi_2(e_2') = \|f_1' - f_2'\| \cdot 1 \\ \Phi_1(e_1'') &= \Phi_2(e_2'') = \|f_1'' - f_2''\| \cdot 1, \end{aligned}$$

and this implies that

$$\|f_1' - f_2'\| = \|f_1'' - f_2''\| = 1,$$

because $\Phi_i(e_i')$ and $\Phi_i(e_i'')$ are non-zero projections, due to assumption of eq. (46). Since the last equalities lead to contradiction, it follows that we have either

(a) $\|f_1' - f_2'\| = 1$ and $\|f_1'' - f_2''\| = 0$, or
(b) $\|f_1' - f_2'\| = 0$ and $\|f_1'' - f_2''\| = 1$.

In case (a), we have

$$f_0 = f_1' - f_2',$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \|f_0\| \\ &\leq \|f_1'\| + \|f_2'\| \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi_1(e_1')\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi_2(e_2')\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(e_1'\xi^0_{2f_1} \mid \xi^0_{2f_1}\right) + \frac{1}{4}\left(e_2'\xi^0_{2f_2} \mid \xi^0_{2f_2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|e_1'\xi^0_{2f_1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|e_2'\xi^0_{2f_2}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|e'\left(\xi^0_{2f_1}, \xi^0_{2f_2}\right)\|^2 \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

From the uniqueness of the Jordan-Hahn-Grothendieck decomposition, we infer that

$$f_1' = f_1 \text{ and } f_2' = f_2.$$

This gives

$$\Phi_1(e_1') = 1 \text{ and } \Phi_2(e_2') = 1,$$

from which we infer that

$$e_1' e_1^B = e_1^B \text{ and } e_2' e_2^B = e_2^B;$$

we also obtain

$$\Phi_1(e_1'') = 0 \text{ and } \Phi_2(e_2'') = 0,$$

which give

$$e_1'' e_1^B = 0 \text{ and } e_2'' e_2^B = 0.$$

It follows that

$$e'' \begin{pmatrix} e_1^B & 0 \\ 0 & e_2^B \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Since we have

$$e_B \leq \begin{pmatrix} e_1^B & 0 \\ 0 & e_2^B \end{pmatrix},$$

it follows that

$$e'' e_B = 0.$$

Similarly, in case (b) we have

$$e' e_B = 0.$$

This shows that 0 and 1 are the only projections in $(\pi_f(B)' \wedge \pi_f(B)'')e_B$. The Theorem is proved. □

Remark 3.9. The preceding Theorem is an extension to the general, possibly non-separable case, of [2, Proposition 18, p. 373].

The following is an extension of [2, Proposition 16, p. 372].

Proposition 3.10. *If B separates $P(A)$ and if each factor state on B has a unique state extension to A, then $B = A$.*

Proof. With the constructions and notations in Section 3.3, assume that $B \neq A$. Then

$$f_1|_B = f_2|_B, \tag{53}$$

$$2f_1|_B = f|_B, \text{ and} \tag{54}$$

$$2f_2|_B = f|_B. \tag{55}$$

By Theorem 3.8 it follows that both states $2f_1$ and $2f_2$ of A are extensions of the factorial state $f|_B \in F(B)$. By the assumption of the Proposition it follows that $2f_1 = 2f_2$ and this leads to the contradiction $f_0 = 0$. The Proposition is proved. □

3.4. The following is a "Separation Theorem", which will be used in the proof of our generalization of the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem.

Theorem 3.11. *Let A be any unital C^*-algebra and let $B \subset A$ be a C^*-subalgebra, containing the unit element 1 of A. Then, if B separates $P(A)$, disjoint representations of A restrict to disjoint representations of B.*

Proof. Let $\pi_1 \colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_1)$ and $\pi_2 \colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_2)$ be two disjoint representations of A. We shall prove that the restrictions $\pi_1|_B \colon B \to \mathcal{L}(H_1)$ and $\pi_2|_B \colon B \to \mathcal{L}(H_2)$ are disjoint.

Indeed, by contradiction, let $w \colon H_1 \to H_2$ be any non-zero partial isometry, such that

$$\pi_2(b)w = w\pi_1(b), \qquad b \in B.$$

Then $w^*w = e_1$ and $ww^* = e_2$ are projections, such that $e_1 \in \pi_1(B)'$ and $e_2 \in \pi_2(B)'$.

Let us consider the representations

$$\rho_1 \colon \pi_1(B) \to \mathcal{L}(e_1H_1) \text{ and } \rho_2 \colon \pi_2(B) \to \mathcal{L}(e_2H_2), \qquad b \in B,$$

given by

$$\rho_1(\pi_1(b)) = e_1\pi_1(b) \text{ and } \rho_2(\pi_2(b)) = e_2\pi_2(b), \qquad b \in B,$$

and define the mapping

$$\Phi \colon \pi_1(B)e_1 \to \pi_2(B)e_2,$$

by

$$\Phi(\pi_1(b)e_1) = w\pi_1(b)w^*, \qquad b \in B.$$

Then Φ is an isomorphism of C^*-algebras. Let $p_2 \in P(\pi_2(B)e_2$ and define $p_1 = p_2 \circ \Phi$. Then $p_1 \in P(\pi_1(B)e_1)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} p_1(\pi_1(b)e_1) &= p_1(\Phi(\pi_1(b)e_1)) = p_2(w\pi_1(b)w^*) \\ &= p_1(\pi_2(b)ww^*) = p_2(\pi_2(b)e_2), \qquad b \in B. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Let us define q_1 and q_2 by

$$q_1(\pi_1(b)) = p_1(\rho_1(\pi_1(b)), \qquad q_2(\pi_2(b)) = p_2(\rho_2(\pi_2(b)), \qquad b \in B.$$

By Proposition 2.1, we can identify π_{q_1} and π_{q_2} with $\pi_{p_1} \circ \pi_{\rho_1}$ and $\pi_{p_2} \circ \pi_{\rho_2}$, respectively, from which we infer that $q_1 \in P(\pi_1(B))$ and $q_2 \in P(\pi_2(B))$.

Since $\pi_1(B)$ separates $P(\pi_1(A))$ and $\pi_2(B)$ separates $P(\pi_2(A))$, it follows that q_1 has a unique extension $r_1 \in P(\pi_1(A))$, such that $r_1|_{\pi_1(B)} = q_1$, and q_2 has unique extension $r_2 \in P(\pi_2(A))$, such that $r_2|_{\pi_2(B)} = q_2$.

Let us define

$$s_1(a) = r_1(\pi_1(a)), \text{ and } s_2(a) = r_2(\pi_2(a)), \qquad a \in A.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_1(b) &= r_1(\pi_1(b)) = q_1(\pi_1(b)) \\ &= p_1(\rho_1(\pi_1(b))) = p_1(e_1\pi_1(b)) \\ &= p_2(\pi_2(b)e_2) = p_2(\rho_2(\pi_2(b))) \\ &= q_2(\pi_2(b)) = r_2(\pi_2(b)) \\ &= s_2(b), \qquad\qquad b \in B. \end{aligned}$$

Since s_1 and s_2 belong to $P(A)$, it follows that $s_1 = s_2$, because B separates $P(A)$.

We obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A \arrow[r, "\theta_{s_1}"] \arrow[d, "\pi_1"'] & A/L_s \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}"] \arrow[d, "\theta_1"'] & A/L_s \arrow[d, "\theta_2"] & A \arrow[l, "\theta_{s_2}"'] \arrow[d, "\pi_2"] \\
\pi_1(A) \arrow[r, "\theta_{r_1}"'] & \pi_1(A)/L_{r_1} \arrow[r, "w_0"'] & \pi_2(A)/L_{r_2} & \pi_2(A) \arrow[l, "\theta_{r_2}"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where θ_1 is defined by

$$\theta_1(\theta_{s_1}(a)) = \theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a)), \qquad a \in A, \tag{57}$$

and θ_2 is defined by

$$\theta_2(\theta_{s_2}(a)) = \theta_{r_2}(\pi_2(a)), \qquad a \in A. \tag{58}$$

From

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a_1)) \mid \theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a_2))) &= r_1(\pi_1(a_2)^*\pi_1(a_1)) \\ &= r_1(\pi_1(a_2^*a_1)) \\ &= s_1(a_2^*a_1) \\ &= (\theta_{s_1}(a_1) \mid \theta_{s_1}(a_2))\,, \qquad a_1, a_2 \in A, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta_{r_2}(\pi_2(a_1)) \mid \theta_{r_2}(\pi_2(a_2))) &= r_2(\pi_2(a_2)^*\pi_2(a_1)) \\ &= r_2(\pi_2(a_2^*a_1)) \\ &= s_2(a_2^*a_1) \\ &= (\theta_{s_2}(a_1) \mid \theta_{s_2}(a_2))\,, \qquad a_1, a_2 \in A, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that the definitions (57) and (58) are correct and the mappings θ_1 and θ_2 extend to unitary operators between the corresponding Hilbert spaces.

Let us define

$$w_0 = \theta_2 \circ \theta_1^{-1}.$$

Then w_0 is a unitary operator $w_0\colon H_{r_1} \to H_{r_2}$, for which we have

$$\begin{aligned}
w_0\pi_1(a_1)\theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a_2)) &= w_0\theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a_1a_2)) = \left(\theta_2 \circ \theta_1^{-1}\right)\left(\theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a_1a_2))\right)\\
&= \theta_2(\theta_{s_1}(a_1a_2)) = \theta_2(\pi_{s_1}(a_1)\theta_{s_1}(a_2))\\
&= \theta_2(\pi_{s_2}(a_1)\theta_{s_2}(a_2)) = \theta_2(\theta_{s_2}(a_1a_2))\\
&= \theta_{r_2}(\pi_2(a_1a_2)) = \theta_{r_2}(\pi_2(a_1)\pi_2(a_2))\\
&= \pi_2(a_1)\theta_{r_2}(\pi_2(a_2)) = \pi_2(a_1)\theta_2(\theta_{s_2}(a_2))\\
&= \pi_2(a_1)\theta_2(\theta_{s_1}(a_1)) = \pi_2(a_1)\left(\theta_2 \circ \theta_1^{-1}\right)\left(\theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a_2))\right)\\
&= \pi_2(a_1)w_0(\theta_{r_1}(\pi_1(a_2))), \ \text{ for } a_1, a_2 \in A.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives that

$$w_0\pi_1(a_1) = \pi_2(a_1)w_0, \qquad a_1 \in A,$$

and, therefore, we have that $w_0 = 0$, because π_1 and π_2 are assumed to be disjoint. This implies a contradiction and the Theorem is proved. ☐

We shall say that two states $f_1, f_2 \in S(A)$ are disjoint (notation $f_1 \oslash f_2$) if the corresponging cyclic representations are disjoint; i.e., $\pi_{f_1} \oslash \pi_{f_2}$. We can prove now

Theorem 3.12. *If B separates $P(A)$ and if f_1 and f_2 are two disjoint states of A, then their restrictions $r(f_1)$ and $r(f_2)$ are disjoint.*

Proof. As remarked in the proof of Theorem 3.6, the representations $\pi_{r(f_i)}$ can be identified with subrepresentations of the restrictions $\pi_{f_i}|_B$, $i = 1, 2$; and subrepresentations of disjoint representations are disjoint. ☐

3.5. In this Section we shall prove a converse to Theorem 3.6; namely, we have

Theorem 3.13. *If $1 \in B$ and if B separates $P(A)$, then $f \in S(A)$ and $r(f) \in F(B)$ implies $f \in F(A)$.*

Proof. (a) Let $f_1 \in S(A)$ and $f_2 \in S(A)$ be two disjoint states of A. Then f_1 and f_2 are orthogonal (notation $f_1 \perp f_2$; see [17, Lemma 6]).

Define

$$f = \lambda f_1 + (1-\lambda)f_2,$$

where $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.

Let $\pi_i\colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be the representations obtained by the GNS-construction, corresponding to f_i, with the cyclic vector $\xi_i^0 \in H_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

Since $f_1 \perp f_2$, π_f can be identified with

$$\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2\colon A \to \mathcal{L}(H_1 \oplus H_2),$$

with the cyclic vector

$$\xi_f^0 = \left(\sqrt{\lambda}\xi_1^0, \sqrt{1-\lambda}\xi_2^0\right) \in H_1 \oplus H_2.$$

Since f_1 and f_2 are assumed to be disjoint, we have

$$(\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2)(A)' = \pi_1(A)' \oplus \pi_2(A)' \text{ and}$$
$$(\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2)(A)'' = \pi_1(A)'' \oplus \pi_2(A)''$$

(see [11, theorem 3.8.11].

Let

$$e_1 \colon H_1 \oplus H_2 \to H_1 \oplus \{0\},$$
$$e_2 \colon H_1 \oplus H_2 \to \{0\} \oplus H_2$$

be the corresponding orthogonal projections. Then we have $e_1, e_2 \in \pi_f(A)'$, and also

$$\overline{\pi_1(B)\xi_1^0} = e'_B H_1,$$
$$\overline{\pi_2(B)\xi_2^0} = e''_B H_2,$$

where $e'_B \in \pi_1(B)'$ and $e''_B \in \pi_2(B)'$ are projections. The representation

$$\pi_{f_1|_B} \colon B \to \mathcal{L}(H_{f_i|_B})$$

identifies with the mapping

$$B \ni b \mapsto \pi_1(b)e'_B \in \mathcal{L}(e'_B H_1),$$

whereas the representation

$$\pi_{f_2|_B} \colon B \to \mathcal{L}(H_{f_2|_B})$$

identifies with the mapping

$$b \ni b \mapsto \pi_2(b)e''_B \in \mathcal{L}(e''_B H_2).$$

Similarly, the representation

$$\pi_{f|_B} \colon B \to \mathcal{L}(H_{f|_B})$$

identifies with the mapping

$$B \ni b \mapsto (\pi_1(b) \oplus \pi_2(b))\, e_B,$$

where $e_B \in \pi_f(B)'$ is the projection determined by

$$\overline{(\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2)(B)\xi_f^0} = e_b(H_1 \oplus H_2)$$

and it is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_{11} & e_{12} \\ e_{21} & e_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(b)e_{11} &= e_{11}\pi_1(b), \quad \pi_1(b)e_{12} = e_{12}\pi_2(b), \\ \pi_2(b)e_{21} &= e_{21}\pi_1(b), \quad \pi_2(b)e_{22} = e_{22}\pi_2(b), \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

for any $b \in B$. From

$$(\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2)(B)\xi_f^0 \subset (\pi_1(B) \oplus \pi_2(B))\xi_f^0$$

we infer that

$$e_B \leq e'_B \oplus e''_B,$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{11}e'_B &= e'_B e_{11} = e_{11}, \\ e_{12}e''_B &= e'_B e_{12} = e_{12}, \\ e_{21}e'_B &= e''_B e_{21} = e_{21}, \\ e_{22}e''_B &= e''_B e_{22} = e_{22}. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

From eqs. (59) and (60) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_2(b)e''_B e_{21} &= e_{21}e'_B \pi_1(b), \qquad b \in B, \\ \pi_1(b)e'_B e_{12} &= e_{12}e''_B \pi_2(b), \qquad b \in B. \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Since the states f_1 and f_2 are assumed to be disjoint, by Theorem 3.12 the restrictions $f_1|_B$ and $f_2|_B$ are disjoint. From eqs. (60) and (61) we infer that

$$e_{21} = e''_B e_{21} = e_{21}e'_B = 0, \tag{62}$$

$$e_{12} = e'_B e_{12} = e_{12}e''_B = 0, \tag{63}$$

because there are no non-zero intertwining operators for $\pi_{f_1|_B}$ and $\pi_{f_2|_B}$.

On the other hand, $\pi_{f|_B}(B)'$ can be identified with $e_B\pi_f(B)'e_B$. Any operator $b' \in e_B\pi_f(B)'e_B$ is of the form

$$b' = \begin{pmatrix} b'_{11} & b'_{12} \\ b'_{21} & b'_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{64}$$

with entries satisfying the following identities

$$\begin{aligned} e_{11}b'_{11} = b'_{11} = b'_{11}e_{11}, \quad e_{22}b'_{21} = b'_{21} = b'_{21}e_{11}, \\ e_{11}b'_{12} = b'_{12} = b'_{12}e_{22}, \quad e_{22}b'_{22} = b'_{22} = b'_{22}e_{22}, \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(b)b'_{11} = b'_{11}\pi_1(b), \quad \pi_2(b)b'_{21} = b'_{21}\pi_1(b), \\ \pi_1(b)b'_{12} = b'_{12}\pi_2(b), \quad \pi_2(b)b'_{22} = b'_{22}\pi_2(b), \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

for any $b \in B$. Conversely, for any matrix as in eq. (64), whose entries are bounded linear operators $b'_{ij} \colon H_j \to H_i$, $i = 1, 2$, satisfying eqs. (65) and (66), we have that

$$b' \in e_B\pi_f(B)'e_B.$$

From eqs. (60), (65) and (66), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(b)e'_B b'_{12} &= b'_{12}\pi_2(b)e''_B, \qquad b \in B, \\ \pi_2(b)e''_B b'_{21} &= b'_{21}\pi_1(b)e'_B, \qquad b \in B, \end{aligned}$$

and this implies that

$$b'_{12} = b'_{21} = 0,$$

because, as above, $f_1|_B \oslash f_2|_B$. This implies

$$e_B\pi_f(B)'e_B = \big(e_{11}\pi_1(B)'e_{11}\big) \oplus \big(e_{22}\pi_2(B)'e_{22}\big) \tag{67}$$

$$\pi_f(B)''e_B = \big(\pi_1(B)''e_{11}\big) \oplus \big(\pi_2(B)''e_{22}\big)\,. \tag{68}$$

From eqs. (67) and (68) we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}&(e_B\pi_f(B)'e_B) \cap (\pi_f(B)''e_B)\\ &= \big[(e_{11}\pi_1(B)'e_{11}) \cap (\pi_1(B)''e_{11})\big] \oplus \big[(e_{22}\pi_f(B)'e_{22}) \cap (\pi_2(B)''e_{22})\big]\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

and this shows that $r(f)$ is not factorial.

(b) Let now $f \in S(A)$ be any state which is not factorial; i.e., $f \notin F(A)$. Then we have that

$$\pi_f(A)' \cap \pi_f(A)'' \neq \mathbb{C}\,1.$$

Let $e', e'' \in \pi_f(A)' \cap \pi_f(A)''$ be two non-zero projections, such that $e' + e'' = 1$. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned}f'(a) &= \|e'\xi_f^0\|^{-2}\left(\pi_f(a)e'\xi_f^0 \mid e'\xi_f^0\right), \qquad && a \in A,\\ f''(a) &= \|e''\xi_f^0\|^{-2}\left(\pi_f(a)e''\xi_f^0 \mid e''\xi_f^0\right), && a \in A.\end{aligned}$$

Then $f' \in s(A), f'' \in S(A), f' \oslash f''$ and

$$f = \lambda f' + (1-\lambda) f'',$$

where

$$\lambda = \|e'\xi_f^0\|^2, \qquad 1-\lambda = \|e''\xi_f^0\|^2,$$

and $\lambda \in (0,1)$. From eq. (69) it follows that $f|_B$ is not factorial. The Theorem is proved.

□

Corollary 3.14. *If B separates $P(A)$, then the states $2f_1$ and $2f_2$ described in Section 2.2 are factorial.*

Proof. We have $r(2f_1) = r(2f_2) = r(f)$, and $r(f) \in F(B)$, by Theorem 3.13. □

Remark 3.15. Theorems 3.6 and 3.13 can be formulated as follows

Theorem 3.16. *If $1 \in B$ and if B separates $P(A)$, then*

$$r(F(A)) = F(B) \text{ and } r^{-1}(F(B)) = F(A).$$

4. Separation of the Set of the Factorial States

4.1. We shall prove in this Section our generalization of the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem. Indeed, we have

Theorem 4.1. *Let B be a C^*-subalgebra of the unital C^*-algebra A, containing the unit element of A. If B separates $F(A)$, then $B = A$.*

Proof. By contradiction, assume that $B \neq A$. Then the set N, defined in Section 2.2, is not reduced to $\{0\}$. Consider any $f_0 \in \operatorname{ex} N$. We shall have the Jordan-Hahn-Grothendieck decomposition $f_0 = f_1 - f_2$. Define $f_1 + f_2$. Since B separates $F(A)$, it separates $P(A)$ and then, by Theorem 3.8, we have that $r(f) \in F(B)$. From Theorem 3.13 we infer that $f \in F(A)$. Since $r(2f_1) = r(2f_2) = r(f)$, it follows that $2f_1 \in F(A)$ and $2f_2 \in F(A)$. Since B separates $F(A)$ and $r(2f_1) = r(2f_2)$, it follows that $f_1 = f_2$, and this implies that $f_0 = 0$, a contradiction. The Theorem is proved. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The two Conjectures discussed at the beginning of this paper originate in the paper "The structure of certain operator algebras", by I. Kaplansky (Trans. Amer. Mat. Soc. 70 (1951), p. 219-255).

The present paper follows after three preprints dedicated to the Stone-Weierstrass Problem, which the author gave a very limited distribution, a few years ago. Two of them had gaps and errors, which the author noticed very soon. The third contained a conditional solution of the Factorial Conjecture, whose restriction is removed in the present paper.

Special thanks are due to Professors Ch. J. K. Batty, who noticed the mistakes and obtained Proposition 2.13 independently of the author of this paper, and Ola Bratteli, who showed an encouraging interest during the long elaboration of this work.

The author is now retired from the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, but will happily receive correspondence at `silviu.teleman@gmail.com`.

REFERENCES

[1] C.A. Akemann, The General Stone-Weierstrass Problem, J. Func. Analysis, vol. 4, 1969, 277-294.

[2] J.Anderson, J.W. Bunce, Stone-Weierstrass Theorems for Seperable C^*-Algebras, J. Operator Theory, vol. 6, 1981, 363-374.

[3] L. Asmimov, A. J. Ellis, Convexity Theory and its Applications in Functional Analysis, Academic Press, London, New York, Toronto, Sydney, San Francisco, 1980.

[4] C. J. K. Batty, Semi-Perfect C^*-Algebras and the Stone-Weierstrass Problem, J. London Math. Soc., (2), vol. 34, 1986, 97-110.

[5] L. de Branges, The Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 10, 1959, 822-824.

[6] O. Bratteli, D. W. Robinson, Operatos Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1, Springer Verlag, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1979.

[7] J. Dixmier, Les C^*-Algebras et leurs Repsentations, Gautheir-Villars, Paris, 1969.

[8] J. Glimm, A Stone-Weierstrass Theorem for C^*-Algebras, Ann. Math., vol. 72, 1960, 216-244.

[9] R. V. Kadison, J. R. Ringrose, Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras, von. I, Acad. Press, New York, London, etc., 1983; von. II, Acad. Press, New York, London, etc., 1986.

[10] R. Longo, Solution of the Factorial Stone-Weierstrass Conjecture. An application of Standard Split W^*-inclusions, Invent. Math., vol. 76, 1984, 145-155.

[11] G. K. Pedersen, C^*-algebras and their Automorphism Groups, Academic Press, London, New York, etc., 1979.

[12] S. Popa, Constructing Semiregular Maximal Abelian *-Algebras in Factors, Invent. Math., vol. 76, 1984, 157-161.

[13] W. Rudin, Functional Analysis, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill Inc., New York, etc., 1991.

[14] S. Sakai, C^*-Algebras and W^*-Algebras, Springer Verlad, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1971.

[15] C. F. Skau, Orthogonal Measures on the State Space of a C^*-Algebra, Algebras in Analysis, ed. by W. Williamson, Academic Press, London, New York, etc., 1975.

[16] S. Teleman, An Introduction to Choquet Theory with Applications to Reduction Theory, INCREST Preprint Series in Mathematics, No. 71, 1980.

[17] S. Teleman, On the Boundary Barycentric Calculus, J. Func. Analysis, 78, No. 1, 1988, 85-98.

[18] S. Teleman, Measure-Theoretic Properteis of the Central Topology on the Set of the Factorial States of a C^*-Algebra. Central Reduction., In "Operator Theory. Proceedings of the 1988 GPOTS Nabash Conference", Pitman Research Notes in Mathematecs Series, vol. 225, 1990, 107-183.

[19] S. Teleman, Sur les Mesures Maximales, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, t. 318, Serie I, 1994, 525-528.

[20] S. Teleman, On Maximal Measures, Manuscript, 1993, 1-123.

[21] S. Teleman, On the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem I, Manuscript, 1994, 1-9.

[22] S. Teleman, On the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem II, Manuscript, 1996, 1-23.

[23] S. Teleman, On the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem III, Manuscript, 1998, 1-17.

[24] S. Teleman, On the Borel Enveloping C^*-Algebra of a C^*-Algebra, Rend. Cercolo Matematico di Palermo, Serie II, Tomo XLVI, 1997, 213-254.